

$\square_{\kappa, < \omega}$ HOLDS IN $L[\vec{E}]$

ERNEST SCHIMMERLING

PRELIMINARY VERSION

Definition 0. Suppose that $\lambda \leq \kappa$ are cardinals and Γ is a subset of (κ, κ^+) . By $\square_{\kappa, < \lambda}(\Gamma)$, we mean the principle asserting that there is a sequence $\langle \mathcal{F}_\nu \mid \nu \in \lim(\Gamma) \rangle$ such that for every $\nu \in \lim(\Gamma)$, the following hold.

- (1) $1 \leq \text{card}(\mathcal{F}_\nu) < \lambda$
- (2) The following hold for every $C \in \mathcal{F}_\nu$.
 - (a) $C \subseteq \nu \cap \Gamma$
 - (b) C is club in ν
 - (c) $\text{o.t.}(C) \leq \kappa$
 - (d) $\bar{\nu} \in \lim(C) \Rightarrow \bar{\nu} \cap C \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\nu}}$

By $\square_{\kappa, \lambda}(\Gamma)$ we mean $\square_{\kappa, < \lambda^+}(\Gamma)$. If $\Gamma = (\kappa, \kappa^+)$, then we write $\square_{\kappa, < \lambda}$ for $\square_{\kappa, < \lambda}(\Gamma)$ and $\square_{\kappa, \lambda}$ for $\square_{\kappa, \lambda}(\Gamma)$.

R.B.Jensen's principles $\square_\kappa$ and $\square_\kappa^*$ are equivalent to $\square_{\kappa, 1}$ and $\square_{\kappa, \kappa}$ respectively. The strongest of these principles, $\square_\kappa$, was recently proved

This research was partially supported by a National Science Foundation Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship.

by Jensen to hold at all κ in the core model for non-overlapping sequences of extenders (“below $0^\sharp$ ”, see [J2]). This improves the result in [Sch], that $\square_{\kappa,2}$ holds in the same model. In reverse chronological order, both results build on [Wy], [We], [S], and [J1].

Here, and in [Sch], the focus is on inner models of W.J.Mitchell and J.R.Steel, introduced in [MiSt]. These are models of the form $L[\vec{E}]$, where $\vec{E}$ is a sequence of partial extenders; overlapping extenders are permitted. The core model for one Woodin cardinal was introduced by Steel in [St1]. This model, called K , is of the form $L[\vec{E}]$.

Assume that there is no inner model with a Woodin cardinal. That various instances of $\square_{\kappa,\lambda}$ hold in $L[\vec{E}]$ was shown in [Sch]. For example, $\square_\kappa$ holds for all $\kappa \leq \lambda$, where λ is the least measurable cardinal of Mitchell order λ^{++} . We showed that $\square_{\kappa,<\kappa}$ holds in $L[\vec{E}]$ at every κ , and used the proof to get a lower bound of one Woodin cardinal on the large cardinal consistency strength of some stationary reflection principles. We showed that $\square_{\kappa,cf(\kappa)}$ holds for all κ in $L[\vec{E}]$, in fact, that,

$$(\kappa^+)^V = (\kappa^+)^{L[\vec{E}]} \implies V \models \square_{\kappa,cf(\kappa)},$$

which implies the same lower bound on the consistency strength of the Proper Forcing Axiom.

We would like to prove that $\square_\kappa$ holds in $L[\vec{E}]$, but we don’t know how. In this paper, we prove the theorem below, which subsumes the results mentioned in the previous paragraph. Using [St2], the theorem extends naturally to meek models (rather than 1-small), and hence to the core model for a proper class of Woodin cardinals of [St3]. We expect that the methods of [SchSt] will yield extensions to tame models, but this is not entirely worked out yet.

About the relationship between the various principles $\square_{\kappa, \lambda}$, we have the following information. Under GCH, if κ is regular, then $\square_{\kappa}^*$ holds (see [J1]). In [BM], it is shown that $\square_{\aleph_\omega}^* + \neg \square_{\aleph_\omega}$ is consistent relative to the existence of a supercompact cardinal. S.Todorćević's showed that PFA implies that $\square_{\kappa, \aleph_1}$ fails for every $\kappa > \aleph_1$ (the required modification of [T] was shown to the author by M.Magidor; see [Sch, 6.3]). More recently, Magidor showed that PFA is consistent with $\forall \kappa \square_{\kappa, \aleph_2}$. An argument due to R.M.Solovay can be adapted to show that if λ is a limit cardinal, and $\kappa \leq \lambda$ is λ^+ -strongly compact, then $\square_{\lambda, < \lambda}$ fails; moreover, if $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \kappa$, then $\square_{\kappa}^*$ fails (this fact shown to the author by A.Kanamori; see [SRK]). Jensen showed in [J2] that if there is a Mahlo cardinal, then $\square_{\aleph_{1,2}} + \neg \square_{\aleph_1}$ holds in a forcing extension.

Corollary 2 follows from Theorem 1 using Steel's result in [St1], that the background certified core model, K^c , satisfies the weak covering property "almost everywhere". Corollary 3 follows directly from Theorem 1 and the weak covering property for K proved in [MiSch]. Extensions to tame mice are possible, using the methods of [SchSt], and will appear elsewhere.

Theorem 1. Suppose that $L[\vec{E}]$ is a 1-small weasel, all of whose levels are iterable. Then for every κ , $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}$ holds in $L[\vec{E}]$.

Corollary 2. Assume that there is no inner model with a Woodin cardinal, and that κ is a measurable cardinal. Then $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}$ holds in V .

Corollary 3. Assume that there is no inner model with a Woodin cardinal. Suppose that κ is a singular cardinal such that $(V_{\kappa+})^\#$ exists. Then $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}$ holds in V .

Proof of Theorem 1. We shall assume that the reader is familiar with [MiSt] and §§1–4 of [Sch]. The proof here shall incorporate the

ideas of §5 of [Sch], plus a few new ones. Unfortunately, Lemma 4.3 of [Sch] is false (an error occurs in the proof of 4.3(a)). However, there is a way of avoiding the use of Lemma 4.3 in the proofs of weak square given in §5 of [Sch]. It should be apparent from the proof that we are about to give, what modification to §5 of [Sch] is required.

Work in $L[\vec{E}]$. Consider any cardinal α . Let Γ be the collection of local α^+ 's, that is, the collection of limit ordinals δ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_\delta \models \text{“}\alpha \text{ is the largest cardinal”}.$$

For any $\delta \in \Gamma$, let $\beta(\delta)$ be the least β such that

$$\mathcal{J}_{\beta+1} \models \text{card}(\delta) = \alpha.$$

For any premouse $\mathcal{M}$ and for any integer n , by the Σ_n coding structure for $\mathcal{M}$, we mean the structure $\mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{M})$ given by definition 2.7.1 or 2.7.2 of [Sch]. For any $\delta \in \Gamma$, we define an integer $n(\delta)$ and a structure $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ in two cases, as follows. If $\mathcal{J}_\delta$ is a type III mouse, so that $\beta(\delta) = \delta$, then we set $n(\delta) = 1$ and $\mathcal{N}(\delta) = \mathcal{J}_\delta$. Otherwise, we let $n(\delta)$ be the least integer n such that $\rho_n(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}) = \alpha$, and let $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ be the $\Sigma_{n(\delta)-1}$ coding structure for $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}$. The reason for the lack of uniformity in the definition is that when $\mathcal{J}_\delta$ is a type III mouse, the Σ_0 coding structure for $\mathcal{J}_\delta$ is $(\mathcal{J}_\delta)^{sq}$, the squash of $\mathcal{J}_\delta$, which has ordinal height α ; in particular, δ is not contained in $(\mathcal{J}_\delta)^{sq}$. Nevertheless, in all cases $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ is an amenable structure over which δ is Σ_1 -collapsed.

Now fix the cardinal κ for which we are showing $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}$. To avoid technicalities, assume that κ is a limit cardinal (the other case follows already from results in [Sch], or by an easy modification of what's to come). Let SC be the collection of $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $o(\alpha) \geq \kappa^+$, where

$$o(\alpha) = \sup(\{\nu \mid \text{crit}(E_\nu) = \alpha\})$$

(with the possibility that $o(\alpha) = \text{OR}$ in mind). Let $\tilde{\lambda} < \kappa^+$ be large enough so that if $\tilde{\lambda} < \nu < \kappa^+$ and $\text{crit}(E_\nu) < \kappa$, then $\text{crit}(E_\nu) \in \text{SC}$. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_\kappa - \tilde{\lambda}$. Note that Γ is club in κ^+ , so it is enough to prove $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}(\Gamma)$, which is what we shall do.

Given an extender F , let $s(F)$ be the dodd-parameter of F and let $\tau(F)$ be the dodd-projectum of F . That is, define $s(F)$ to be the longest parameter

$$s = \{s_0 > \cdots > s_i\}$$

such that whenever $0 \leq k \leq i$, we have that s_k is the largest element of

$$\{\xi > \text{crit}(F) \mid \xi \text{ is an } F\text{-generator relative to } (s \restriction k)\},$$

and then put

$$\tau(F) = \sup(\text{crit}(F)^+ \cup \{\xi \mid \xi \text{ is an } F\text{-generator relative to } s(F)\}).$$

This notion is discussed in §3 of [Sch]. In the obvious order, $(s(F), \tau(F))$ is the least pair (s, τ) with $\tau \geq \text{crit}(F)^+$, such that F and $F \restriction (\tau \cup s)$ have the same ultrapower. If $\mathcal{M}$ is a structure that interprets the relation symbol $\dot{F}$ as coding an extender or partial extender, then we define $s(\mathcal{M}) = s(\dot{F}^\mathcal{M})$ and $\tau(\mathcal{M}) = \tau(\dot{F}^\mathcal{M})$.

We make some remarks and set some notation. Recall from [MiSt] that the language of potential premice (ppm's) has only the relation symbols $\dot{E}$, $\dot{E}$, and $\dot{F}$, but that the fine structure for ppm's is based on the same language expanded by the constant symbols $\dot{\mu}$, $\dot{\nu}$, and $\dot{\gamma}$. To us, a ppm will be a structure in the expanded language, what is called an “expanded ppm” in [MiSt]. In fact, having the constant symbols around only makes a significant difference in the active, type II case. If $\mathcal{M}$ is a passive ppm then $\dot{\mu}^\mathcal{M} = \dot{\nu}^\mathcal{M} = \dot{\gamma}^\mathcal{M} = 0$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an active, type I ppm, then $\dot{\mu}^\mathcal{M} = \text{crit}(\dot{F}^\mathcal{M})$, $\dot{\nu}^\mathcal{M} = (\dot{\mu}^+)^\mathcal{M}$, and $\dot{\gamma}^\mathcal{M} = 0$. And if $\mathcal{M}$ is type III, then it is $\mathcal{M}^{sq}$ rather than $\mathcal{M}$ over which we base

the fine structure of $\mathcal{M}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an active ppm, then the following relationships hold.

$$\mathcal{M} \text{ is type I} \implies s(\mathcal{M}) = \emptyset \wedge \tau(\mathcal{M}) = \dot{\nu}^{\mathcal{M}} = (\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{M}}$$

$$\mathcal{M} \text{ is type II} \implies s(\mathcal{M})_0 = \dot{\nu}^{\mathcal{M}} - 1$$

$$\mathcal{M} \text{ is type III} \implies s(\mathcal{M}) = \emptyset \wedge \tau(\mathcal{M}) = \dot{\nu}^{\mathcal{M}}.$$

Partition Γ into the following three pieces (no one of which need be club in κ^+). Let Γ_{hull} the collection of $\nu \in \Gamma$ for which at least one of the following hold.

- (a) $n(\nu) > 1$
- (b) $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}$ is passive
- (c) $(\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}} \geq \nu$
- (d) $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}$ is type III and $\tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}) \geq \nu$

Let Γ_{triv} be the collection of $\nu \in \Gamma$ such that

$$\nu \notin \Gamma_{hull} \wedge (\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}} < \nu \leq \tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}).$$

Finally, put $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$ if and only if $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}) = \kappa$. It is straightforward to see that $\{\Gamma_{hull}, \Gamma_{triv}, \Gamma_{lift}\}$ is a partition of Γ . At times we shall also refer to $\{\Gamma_{hull}^\alpha, \Gamma_{triv}^\alpha, \Gamma_{lift}^\alpha\}$, which we take to be the analogous partition of Γ_α .

In §2 of [Sch], it is shown how to construct a sequence

$$B_{hull} = \langle B_{hull}(\nu) \mid \nu \in \lim(\Gamma) \cap \Gamma_{hull} \rangle$$

such that for any $\nu \in \lim(\Gamma) \cap \Gamma_{hull}$,

- (a) $B_{hull}(\nu)$ is club in $\nu \cap \Gamma$
- (b) $\text{o.t.}(B_{hull}(\nu)) \leq \kappa$
- (c) $\bar{\nu} \in \lim(B_{hull}(\nu)) \implies (\bar{\nu} \in \lim(\Gamma) \cap \Gamma_{hull} \wedge B_{hull}(\bar{\nu}) = \bar{\nu} \cap B_{hull}(\nu))$

The method for defining B_{hull} is an extension of Jensen's method for proving $\square_\kappa$ in L , called the method of “taking hulls”. Our intuition is that $B_{hull}(\nu)$ is our basic club subset of ν when $\nu \in \Gamma_{hull}$. We shall define B_{triv} shortly, and then $B_\emptyset$ and $B_{-\emptyset}$ (both corresponding to Γ_{lift}) somewhat later.

Using Lemma 4.4 of [Sch], we see that if $\nu \in \Gamma_{triv}$, then

$$\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)+1} \models \text{cf}(\nu) = \omega.$$

This means that $\square_\kappa(\Gamma_{triv})$ is trivial. For each $\nu \in \lim \Gamma_{triv}$, let $B_{triv}(\nu)$ be the least set C in the order of construction such that $C \subseteq \nu \cap \Gamma$, C is cofinal in ν , and $\text{o.t.}(C) = \omega$. Set

$$B_{triv} = \langle B_{triv}(\nu) \mid \nu \in \lim(\Gamma_{triv}) \rangle.$$

We caution the reader that we are, by no means, done with the case $\nu \in \Gamma_{hull} \cup \Gamma_{triv}$. We shall come back to this case again after considering the case $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$. (Remark: we shall see that $\Gamma_{lift} \subseteq \lim(\Gamma)$).

Next partition Γ_{lift} into two pieces as follows. Let

$$\Gamma_\emptyset = \{\nu \in \Gamma_{lift} \mid s(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}) = \emptyset\}$$

and let $\Gamma_{-\emptyset} = \Gamma_{lift} - \Gamma_\emptyset$. Then

$$\Gamma_\emptyset = \{\nu \in \Gamma_{lift} \mid \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)} \text{ is type III} \}.$$

For now, fix $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$ and put $\beta = \beta(\nu)$, $F = E_\beta$, $\mu = \text{crit}(F)$, and

$$s = \{s_0 > \dots > s_\ell\} = s(F).$$

Then $\tau(F) = \kappa$. Note that $\mu \in \text{SC}$, because $\nu > \lambda$. Since $\mu < \kappa$, F is an extender over all of $L[\vec{E}]$. Let $W = \text{ult}(L[\vec{E}], F)$, and let $j : L[\vec{E}] \longrightarrow W$ be the ultrapower map.

Consider an arbitrary $\delta \in \Gamma_\mu$. Let $\mathcal{Q}_\delta = \text{ult}(\mathcal{N}(\delta), F \restriction (\kappa \cup s))$, and let

$$i_\delta : \mathcal{N}(\delta) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta$$

be the ultrapower map. Put $\lambda_\delta = (\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}$. Let $k_\delta : \mathcal{Q}_\delta \longrightarrow j(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$ be given by

$$k_\delta([a \cup s, f]_{F \upharpoonright (\kappa \cup s)}^{\mathcal{N}(\delta)}) = j(f)(a \cup s)$$

for $f \in |\mathcal{N}(\delta)|$ and $a \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$.

Remarks. To indicate the dependence on ν of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$, i_δ , λ_δ , k_δ , etc., we shall sometimes write $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^\nu$, i_δ^ν , λ_δ^ν , k_δ^ν , etc. In §5 of [Sch], we were writing ν_δ for what corresponds to λ_δ here.

Lemma 1.1. With $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$, the following hold for sufficiently large δ in Γ_μ .

- (1) (a) k_δ is an almost Σ_1 -elementary embedding of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ into

$$j(\mathcal{N}(\delta)) = (\mathcal{N}(j(\delta)))^W$$

- (b) $\delta \in \Gamma_{lift}^\mu \implies$

k_δ is a cofinal, Σ_1 -elementary embedding of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ into

$$j(\mathcal{N}(\delta)) = (\mathcal{N}(j(\delta)))^W$$

- (2) $\kappa < \lambda_\delta < \nu$ and $\lambda_\delta = \text{crit}(k_\delta)$

- (3) $\lambda_\delta \in \Gamma$

- (4) $\text{dom}(\vec{E}) \cap (\mu, \delta) \neq \emptyset$

- (5) $0 \leq m \leq \ell \implies F \upharpoonright (s_m \cup (s \upharpoonright m)) \in \text{ran}(k_\delta)$

- (6) $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is 1-sound and 1-solid, $\rho_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \kappa$, and $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))) \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)$

- (7) $\delta \notin \Gamma_\emptyset \implies \mathcal{Q}_\delta = \mathcal{N}(\lambda_\delta) \wedge n(\lambda_\delta) = n(\delta)$

- (8) (a) $\delta \in \Gamma_{hull}^\mu \implies \lambda_\delta \in \Gamma_{hull}$

- (b) $\delta \in \Gamma_{triv}^\mu \implies \lambda_\delta \in \Gamma_{triv}$

- (c) $\delta \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}^\mu \implies \lambda_\delta \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$

We make a few comments before giving the proof. With regard to (7) and (8), the case $\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset$ will be discussed further in Lemma 1.4. The

set $F \restriction (s_m \cup (s \restriction m))$ in (5) is called the m 'th dodd-solidity witness for F . In case we forget to mention it later, clause (4) is used to know that $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}$ satisfies the technical hypothesis of the strong uniqueness, Theorem 6.2 of [MiSt] and of the condensation result, Theorem 2.8 of [Sch].

Proof of 1.1. The proofs of (1)–(8) are the content of claims 1–5 (and environs) of the proof of Lemma 5.6 of [Sch], but we shall remind the reader of the main ideas.

Clause (1). Put $\sigma = \sup(j^{\text{“}}(OR \cap |\mathcal{N}(\delta)|))$. Then k_δ is a cofinal Σ_1 -elementary embedding of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ into $j(\mathcal{N}(\delta)) \restriction \sigma$. For (b), notice that j is continuous at $\beta(\delta)$ when $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}} < \mu$, which is the case when $\delta \in \Gamma_{lift}$.

Clause (2). To assure that $\lambda_\delta > \kappa$, take δ large enough so that for some $f \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$ and some $a \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$, $\kappa = j(f)(a \cup s)$. That $\lambda_\delta < \nu$ follows from the amenability of $\mathcal{J}_\beta$.

Clause (3). To be sure that $\delta \in \Gamma$, we take δ large enough so that $\lambda_\delta > \tilde{\lambda}$.

Clause (4). It is easy to use Theorem 8.2 of [MiSt] to see that $\text{dom}(\vec{E}) \cap \mu^+ \neq \emptyset$.

Clause (5). The dodd-solidity witnesses for F are elements of $J_\beta^{\vec{E}}$, by Theorem 3.2 of [Sch]. Take δ large enough so that there is a function $f \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$ and an $a \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ such that

$$F \restriction (s_m \cup (s \restriction m)) = j(f)(a \cup s).$$

Clause (6). First note that

$$\mathcal{Q}_\delta = \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\kappa \cup i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))) \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s))$$

since $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ is 1-sound, and by the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$. So $\rho_1(\mathcal{Q}) = \kappa$ and it is enough to see that the parameter $i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))) \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)$ is 1-solid over $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$, in the sense of [MiSt]. Say that

$$p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)) = p = \{p_0 > \cdots > p_e\}$$

That $i_\delta(p)$ is 1-solid over $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ means that

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(i_\delta(p_m) \cup (i_\delta(p) \restriction m)) \in |\mathcal{Q}_\delta|$$

whenever $0 \leq m \leq e$. But this is true by the proof of Lemma 4.6 of [MiSt], which shows how

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(i_\delta(p_m) \cup (i_\delta(p) \restriction m))$$

is Σ_0 -definable over $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ from

$$\{\mu\} \cup i_\delta(Th_1^{\mathcal{N}(\delta)}(p_m \cup (p \restriction m)));$$

note that we are using the 1-solidity of $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$. We must also see that

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(k_\delta^{-1}(s_m) \cup i_\delta(p) \cup (k_\delta^{-1}(s) \restriction m)) \in |\mathcal{Q}_\delta|$$

whenever $0 \leq m \leq \ell$. Fix m and let $\mathcal{P} = \text{ult}(\mathcal{N}(\delta), k_\delta^{-1}(F \restriction (s_m \cup (s \restriction m))))$,

$$\sigma : \mathcal{N}(\delta) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}$$

be the ultrapower map, and $\pi : \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow j(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$ be the natural embedding such that $j = \pi \circ \sigma$. Since $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ and $k_\delta^{-1}(F \restriction (s_m \cup (s \restriction m)))$ are members of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$, so is $\mathcal{P}$. A simple calculation shows that

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(k_\delta^{-1}(s_m) \cup i_\delta(p) \cup (k_\delta^{-1}(s) \restriction m)) = Th_1^{\mathcal{P}}(\pi^{-1}(s_m) \cup \sigma(p) \cup (\sigma^{-1}(s) \restriction m)).$$

Clause (7). Suppose that $\delta \notin \Gamma_\emptyset$, so that $j(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$ is the $\Sigma_{n(\delta)-1}$ coding structure for $(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(j(\delta))})^W$. Because (1)–(6) hold, we may apply Σ_n -condensation, Theorem 2.8 of [Sch], to conclude that $\mathcal{Q}_\delta = (\mathcal{N}(\lambda_\delta))^W$. But since $L[\vec{E}]$ and W agree below ν , $\mathcal{Q}_\delta = \mathcal{N}(\lambda_\delta)$.

Clause (8). By (6), we just need to examine $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$. That (a) holds is immediate from the definitions. Suppose that $\delta \in \Gamma_{triv}^\mu$, that is, $\delta \notin \Gamma_{hull}$ and $(\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}} < \delta \leq \tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)})$. Since $\mu = \text{crit}(F)$ is a limit cardinal,

$$(\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}} = (\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}})^+ < \mu,$$

and so

$$(\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} = (\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}})^+ < \mu < \kappa < \lambda_\delta.$$

By Theorem 3.2 of [Sch], $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}$ is dodd-amenable, that is, for every $\xi < \tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)})$,

$$E_{\beta(\delta)} \restriction (\xi \cup s(E_{\beta(\delta)})) \in J_{\beta(\delta)}^{\vec{E}}.$$

An argument essentially the same as that given in Lemma 9.1 of [MiSt], using the fact that $\mu = \text{crit}(F) < \tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)})$, shows that $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \sup(i_\delta \text{``}\tau(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}))$. Thus,

$$\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) > i_\delta(\mu) > \lambda_\delta.$$

Therefore, $\lambda_\delta \in \Gamma_{triv}$.

Finally, suppose that $\delta \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$. As above,

$$(\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} = (\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}})^+ < \mu < \kappa < \lambda_\delta.$$

If we can show that $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \kappa$, then we are done. Assuming otherwise implies that $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) \geq \lambda_\delta$, since $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta)$ is a cardinal of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ and $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) \geq \rho_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta)$. Then $\lambda_\delta \in \Gamma_{triv}$. As noted before, this implies that $\text{cf}(\lambda_\delta) = \omega$.

But

$$\text{cf}(\lambda_\delta) = \text{cf}((\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}) = \text{cf}((\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\delta)}})^+) > \omega,$$

which is a contradiction. ■ Lemma 1.1

Definition 1.2. Let Δ^ν be the tail of Γ_μ on which the conclusion to Lemma 1.1 holds. If $\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset$, then put $B_\emptyset(\nu) = \{\lambda_\delta^\nu \mid \delta \in \Delta^\nu\}$

When the context is clear, we write Δ for Δ^ν . Notice that clauses (6)–(8) of Lemma 1.1 follow from clauses (1)–(5), as our proof showed. This will be important when we need to show that a particular δ is in Δ . Notice that Δ is club in μ^+ and that, if $\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset$, then $B_\emptyset(\nu)$ is club in ν of order type μ^+ .

We shall need to identify $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\lambda_\delta)}$ in the case $\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset$ (which was excluded in 1.1(7) and 1.1(8)). This is the point in §5 of [Sch] where a reference to the fallacious Lemma 4.3 is made, and needs to be corrected. So suppose that $\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset$, that is, $\mathcal{J}_\delta = \mathcal{N}(\delta)$ is a type III mouse. By Lemma 1.1(1)(b), $k_\delta : \mathcal{Q}_\delta \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{j(\delta)}^W$ is a cofinal Σ_1 -elementary embedding. To apply condensation, we would need to know, at least, that $k_\delta \restriction |\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{sq}|$ is an almost Σ_1 -elementary embedding of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{sq}$ into $(\mathcal{J}_{j(\delta)}^W)^{sq}$, but this is not true. In fact, $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is not even a ppm, as it does not satisfy the initial segment condition on its last extender.

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a structure that satisfies all the conditions for being a ppm except possibly the initial segment condition on $\dot{F}^\mathcal{M}$. Put $\mathcal{P} = \text{ult}(\mathcal{M}, \dot{F}^\mathcal{M})$ and let $i : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}$ be the ultrapower map. Suppose that $\xi < i(\dot{\mu}^\mathcal{M})$ and ξ is larger than any generator of $\dot{F}^\mathcal{M}$. Let $\gamma = (\xi^+)^{\mathcal{P}}$ and let G be the $(\dot{\mu}^\mathcal{M}, \gamma)$ -extender derived from i . By the **ξ -scaling of $\mathcal{M}$** , we mean the structure

$$\langle J_\gamma^{\mathcal{P}}, \in, \dot{E}^{\mathcal{P}} \restriction \gamma, G^* \rangle$$

where G^* is the amenable predicate coding G , namely $(\zeta, \sigma, a, x) \in G^* \iff$

$$(\dot{\mu}^\mathcal{M} < \zeta < (\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{M}}) \ \& \ (\xi < \sigma < \gamma) \ \& \ (a, x) \in G \cap ([\sigma]^{<\omega} \times J_\zeta^\mathcal{M}) \in J_\sigma^{\mathcal{P}}$$

Note that the ξ -scaling of $\mathcal{M}$ is not a structure in the (expanded) language of ppm's. By the **trivial completion of $\mathcal{M}$** , we mean the ξ -scaling of $\mathcal{M}$ where ξ is the strict supremum of the generators of $\dot{F}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

Lemma 1.4. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$ and $\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset \cap \Delta^\nu$. Let $\mathcal{Q}^*$ be the trivial completion of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$. Then the following hold.

(a) $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is 1-sound with $s(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$ and $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \rho_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \kappa$

(b) $\tau(\mathcal{Q}^*) = \kappa$ and $s(\mathcal{Q}^*) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$. Moreover, $\rho_1(\mathcal{Q}^*) = \kappa$ and

$$\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset \implies p_1(\mathcal{Q}^*) = \emptyset$$

$$\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset} \implies p_1(\langle \mathcal{Q}^*, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) \rangle) = k_\delta^{-1}(s - \{s_0\})$$

(c) We may interpret the constant symbols $\dot{\mu}$, $\dot{\nu}$, and $\dot{\gamma}$ in $\mathcal{Q}^*$ in way that results in a premouse. In particular, there is an interpretation of $\dot{\gamma}$ in $\mathcal{Q}^*$ such that

$$\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset \implies \langle \mathcal{Q}^*, \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}, \kappa, 0 \rangle = \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\lambda_\delta)}$$

$$\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset} \implies \langle \mathcal{Q}^*, \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}, k^{-1}(s_0) + 1, \dot{\gamma}^{\mathcal{Q}^*} \rangle = \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\lambda_\delta)}$$

Moreover, in either case, $n(\lambda_\delta) = 1 = n(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\lambda_\delta) = \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\lambda_\delta)}$.

(d) $\lambda_\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset \iff \nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset$

(e) $i_\delta(\mu)$ is the least ordinal $\xi \geq \mu$ such that $\xi = [a, f]_{\dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}^*}}^{\mathcal{Q}^*}$ for some

$$a \in [\mu]^{< \omega} \text{ and } f : [\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}^*}]^{|a|} \longrightarrow \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}^*}$$

Proof of 1.4.

Clause (a). From Lemma 1.1(6), we already know that $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is 1-sound with $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$ and $\rho_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \kappa$. Since k_δ is cofinal and Σ_1 -elementary, if ξ is a generator of $\dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}$, then $\xi < i_\delta(\mu) = k_\delta^{-1}(j(\mu))$. Thus, $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) \leq i_\delta(\mu)$. Also, since κ is a cardinal, $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) \geq \kappa$.

Claim. Suppose that $\xi < i_\delta(\mu)$. Then $\xi = [c \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s), h]_{\dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}$ for some $c \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ and some function

$$h : [\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}]^{|c \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)|} \longrightarrow \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}.$$

Proof of Claim. By the 1-soundness of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$, there is a Σ_1 Skolem term η and a parameter $b \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ such that

$$\xi = \eta^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}[b, k_\delta^{-1}(s)].$$

Because the ultrapower map i_δ is cofinal and Σ_1 -elementary, there is a $\sigma < \delta$ such that

$$\xi = \eta^{i_\delta(\mathcal{J}_\delta \restriction \sigma)}[b, k_\delta^{-1}(s)].$$

Pick $a \in [\mu]^{<\omega}$ and $g : \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_\delta} \longrightarrow J_{(\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_\delta})^+}^{\vec{E}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_\delta \restriction \sigma = [a, g]_{\dot{F}^{\mathcal{J}_\delta}}^{\mathcal{J}_\delta};$$

this is possible because $\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset$. Let

$$h : [\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}]^{|a \cup b \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)|} \longrightarrow \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}$$

be defined by

$$h(u) = \eta^{g(u^{a, a \cup b \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)})}[u^{b, a \cup b \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)}, u^{k_\delta^{-1}(s), a \cup b \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)}].$$

Then

$$\xi = i_\delta(h)(a \cup b \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)) = [a \cup b \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s), h]_{\dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}.$$

■ Claim

It follows from the claim that $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \kappa$ and that $s(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) \leq_{lex} k_\delta^{-1}(s)$. But since $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is 1-sound, $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta)$ is the least parameter p such that $\mathcal{Q}_\delta = H_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\kappa \cup p)$. Recalling that $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$ and that $\mathcal{Q}_\delta = H_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\kappa \cup s(\mathcal{Q}_\delta))$, we see that $s(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$, and so we are done with (a).

Clause (b). From Definition 1.3, it is clear that $s(\mathcal{Q}^*) = s(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$ and that $\tau(\mathcal{Q}^*) = \tau(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = \kappa$. Since

$$|\mathcal{Q}^*| = H_1^{\mathcal{Q}^*}(\tau(\mathcal{Q}^*) \cup s(\mathcal{Q}^*)) = H_1^{\mathcal{Q}^*}(\kappa \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)),$$

it enough to see that

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}^*}(\kappa \cup q \cup \{k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)\}) \in |\mathcal{Q}^*|$$

for every parameter $q <_{lex} k_\delta^{-1}(s - \{s_0\})$. Let q be such a parameter and let $\varphi(u, v)$ be a Σ_1 formula in the language of $\mathcal{Q}^*$ (no constant symbols). Then for any $c \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$, we have that $\mathcal{Q}^* \models \varphi[c, q]$ if and only if

$$\exists \xi < (k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \exists \eta < (\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \langle J_\xi^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}, \in, \dot{E}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \upharpoonright \xi, \dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \cap ([\xi]^{<\omega} \times J_\eta^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}) \rangle \models \varphi[c, q].$$

But then $Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}^*}(\kappa \cup q \cup \{k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)\})$ is Σ_1 definable over $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ from $q \cup \{k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)\}$. Since $q <_{lex} k_\delta^{-1}(s - \{s_0\})$ and $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = k_\delta^{-1}(s)$, this implies that

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}^*}(\kappa \cup q \cup \{k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)\}) \in |\mathcal{Q}_\delta|.$$

But $OR^{\mathcal{Q}^*} = (k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \geq (\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}$ and $\dot{E}^{\mathcal{Q}^*} = \dot{E}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \upharpoonright OR^{\mathcal{Q}^*}$, so we are done.

Clauses (c) and (d). First suppose that $s = \emptyset$ (that is, $\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset$). Then, using the elementarity of k_δ and (a), we see that $\dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}^*}$ is the trivial completion of $E_{j(\delta)}^W \upharpoonright \kappa$. It follows from the initial segment condition on $\mathcal{J}_{j(\delta)}^W$ that $\mathcal{Q}^*$ can be expanded to be a type III premouse, and that the resulting premouse is a level of $\mathcal{J}_{j(\delta)}^W$ (note that κ , being a cardinal, is not the index of any extender on a good extender sequence). It is clear that $\mathcal{Q}^*$ expands to be $\mathcal{J}_{\lambda_\delta}^W = \mathcal{J}_{\lambda_\delta}$.

Now suppose that $s \neq \emptyset$. Let ξ be the next generator of $\dot{E}_{j(\delta)}^W$ after s_0 . Note that $\xi < (s_0^+)^W = \beta(\nu)$, so that $\dot{E}^W \upharpoonright (\xi + 1) = \vec{E} \upharpoonright (\xi + 1)$. It follows from the initial segment condition on $\mathcal{J}_{j(\delta)}^W$ that E_ξ is the

trivial completion of $E_{j(\delta)}^W \restriction (s_0 + 1)$. The map k_δ restricts to a cofinal Σ_1 -elementary embedding of $\langle \mathcal{Q}^*, \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) + 1 \rangle$ into $\mathcal{J}_\xi$ (in the language without the constant symbol $\dot{\gamma}$). Lemma 4.1 of [Sch] implies that $\mathcal{J}_\xi \models \eta[c, s_0] = \dot{\gamma}$ for some Σ_1 Skolem term η (for a formula without constant symbols) and some $c \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$. But then $\dot{\gamma}^{\mathcal{J}_\xi} \in \text{ran}(k_\delta)$, and k_δ is a cofinal Σ_1 -elementary embedding of

$$\langle \mathcal{Q}^*, \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) + 1, k^{-1}(\dot{\gamma}^{\mathcal{J}_\xi}) \rangle$$

into $\mathcal{J}_\xi$ (in the language of ppm's, including constant symbols), and the expansion of $\mathcal{Q}^*$ is a premouse. From the definition of ppm's, it is clear that there is a Σ_1 Skolem term σ (for a formula without constant symbols) such that $\mathcal{J}_\xi \models \sigma[\dot{\gamma}] = \dot{\nu} - 1 = s_0$. Therefore,

$$p_1(\langle \mathcal{Q}^*, \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) + 1, k^{-1}(\dot{\gamma}^{\mathcal{J}_\xi}) \rangle) = p_1(\langle \mathcal{Q}^*, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) \rangle),$$

which we saw in 1.4(b) is equal to $k^{-1}(s - \{s_0\})$. It follows that $\mathcal{Q}^*$ expands to a 1-sound premouse. Applying condensation, Theorem 2.6 of [Sch], we see that $\mathcal{Q}^*$ (expanded) is an initial segment of $\mathcal{J}_\xi$. Clearly, $\mathcal{Q}^*$ (expanded) must be $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\lambda_\delta)}$.

Clause (e). It is enough to prove the statement with $\mathcal{Q}^*$ replaced by $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$. But then the statement is clear, since

$$\{[a, f]_{\dot{F}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta} \mid a \in [\mu]^{<\omega} \wedge f : [\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}]^{|a|} \longrightarrow \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}\} = \text{ran}(i_\delta) \cap \text{OR}^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}.$$

■ Lemma 1.4

We are still considering an arbitrary $\nu \in \Gamma_{\text{lift}}$, with $\beta = \beta(\nu)$, $F = E_\beta$, $\mu = \text{crit}(F)$, etc. (there is no assumption on δ).

Definition 1.5. Suppose that E is an extender over $\mathcal{M}$, with $\mu = \text{crit}(E)$ and $s = s(E)$. Let $\delta \in (\mu, (\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}})$. We say that δ is **E -closed** if and only if for every $x \subseteq \mu$, if there are $a \in [\delta]^{<\omega}$ and $f \in J_\delta^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $x = [a \cup s, f]_E^{\mathcal{M}}$, then $x \in J_\delta^{\mathcal{M}}$.

Lemma 1.6. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$, $\delta \in \Delta$, and δ is F -closed. Let r be the longest initial segment q of $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta)$ such that if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\mu \cup q)$ and $\pi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is the inverse of the transitive collapse, then $\pi^{-1}(q) = p_1(\mathcal{M})$. Then $r = i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$.

Proof of 1.6. Recall that $p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))) \cup k_\delta^{-1}(s)$. So r as defined in the statement of the lemma is at least as long as $i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$.

Claim. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\mu \cup p_1(\mathcal{Q}_\delta))$, then $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{H}} = \delta$.

Proof of Claim. Suppose that $x \subseteq \mu$ and $x \in |\mathcal{H}|$. Then there is a Σ_1 -Skolem term η , a parameter $c \in [\mu]^{<\omega}$, and an ordinal $\sigma < \text{OR}^{\mathcal{N}(\delta)}$ such that

$$x = \mu \cap \eta^{i_\delta(\mathcal{N}(\delta) \restriction \sigma)}[c, i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))), k_\delta^{-1}(s)].$$

This is by the 1-soundness of $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ and the fact that i_δ is a cofinal, Σ_1 -elementary embedding. Let

$$f(u) = \eta^{\mathcal{N}(\delta) \restriction \sigma}[c, p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)), (u - u_0)] \cap u_0$$

defined on $[\mu]^{|s|+1}$. Then $f \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$ and $x = i_\delta(f)(s \cup \{\mu\}) = [s \cup \{\mu\}, f]_F^{J_\delta^{\vec{E}}}$. Since δ is F -closed, $x \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$ ■ Claim.

For contradiction, assume that r properly extends $i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$. Let

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\mu \cup r)$$

and let $\pi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta$ be the inverse of the transitive collapse. By the claim and the fact that r contains $i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$, we have that

$$\delta = (\mu^+)^{\mathcal{N}(\delta)} \leq (\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}} \leq (\mu^+)^{\mathcal{H}} = \delta$$

(where $\mathcal{H}$ is as in the claim). So $(\mu^+)^{\mathcal{M}} = \delta$. By condensation, $\mathcal{M}$ is an initial segment of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ and hence of $L[\vec{E}]$. But then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}(\delta)$. This is absurd, since $p_1(\mathcal{M}) = \pi^{-1}(r)$ is strictly longer than $p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$. ■

Definition 1.7. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a 1-sound, amenable structure. Suppose that $\alpha < \rho_1(\mathcal{M})$. Let $r_\alpha(\mathcal{M})$ be the longest initial segment q of $p_1(\mathcal{M})$ such that if $\pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is the inverse of the transitive collapse for $H_1^\mathcal{M}(\alpha \cup q)$, then $\pi^{-1}(q) = p_1(\mathcal{H})$. We say that α is **switching for $\mathcal{M}$** if $r_\beta(\mathcal{M})$ is strictly longer than $r_\alpha(\mathcal{M})$ whenever $\alpha < \beta$.

Lemma 1.8. With $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$, $\delta \in \Delta$ and δ F -closed, we have that

$$r_\mu(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))).$$

Moreover, if $\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$ and δ is sufficiently large, then μ is switching for $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$.

Proof of 1.8. That $r_\mu(\mathcal{Q}_\delta) = i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$ is just a restatement of Lemma 1.6. Assume that $\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$, so that $s \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$X = H_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(\mu^+ \cup i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))) \cup \{s_0\})$$

(the uncollapsed hull).

Claim. If δ is sufficiently large, then $F \restriction s_0 \in \text{ran}(k_\delta)$ and $k_\delta^{-1}(F \restriction s_0) \in X$.

Proof of Claim. The initial segment condition on $\mathcal{J}_\beta$ implies that $F \restriction s_0 \in J_\beta^E$, so for large δ we have that $F \restriction s_0 \in \text{ran}(k_\delta)$. Applying Lemma 4.1 of [Sch] to $\mathcal{J}_\beta$ gives a Σ_1 -Skolem term η and a parameter $a \in [\mu^+]^{<\omega}$ such that

$$F \restriction s_0 = \eta^{\mathcal{J}_\beta}[\mu, a, s_0].$$

It is important here that η is a Skolem term for a formula without constant symbols. Fix some $\gamma < \beta$ such that $F \restriction s_0 = \eta^{\mathcal{J}_\beta \restriction \gamma}[\mu, a, s_0]$. Assume that δ is large enough so that $\mathcal{J}_\beta \restriction \gamma \in \text{ran}(k_\delta)$. It is enough to see $k_\delta^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_\beta \restriction \gamma) \in X$, for then

$$k_\delta^{-1}(F \restriction s_0) = \eta^{k_\delta^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_\beta \restriction \gamma)}[\mu, a, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)] \in X$$

The last predicate of $\mathcal{J}_\beta \restriction \gamma$ codes an extender fragment, so there is some $\delta_0 < \mu^+$ such that $\dot{F}^{\mathcal{J}_\beta \restriction \gamma}$ codes

$$G = F \cap ([\gamma]^{<\omega} \times J_{\delta_0}^{\vec{E}}).$$

Without loss of generality, $\delta_0 \in \Delta$ and

$$\text{ult}(J_{\delta_0}^{\vec{E}}, G) \models s_0^+ = \gamma.$$

Then $G \in \text{ran}(k_\delta)$ and it is enough to see that $k_\delta^{-1}(G \restriction (s_0 + 1)) \in X$. Now $G \restriction (s_0 + 1)$ is the $(\mu, s_0 + 1)$ -extender derived from $j \restriction |\mathcal{N}(\delta_0)|$, which in turn is the inverse transitive collapsing map:

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta_0) = \mathcal{H}_1^{j(\mathcal{N}(\delta_0))}(\mu \cup j(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta_0)))) \longrightarrow j(\mathcal{N}(\delta_0)).$$

If we assume that $\delta > \delta_0$, then $k_\delta^{-1}(G \restriction (s_0 + 1))$ is the $(\mu, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) + 1)$ -extender derived from the inverse transitive collapsing map:

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta_0) = \mathcal{H}_1^{i_\delta(\mathcal{N}(\delta_0))}(\mu \cup i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta_0)))) \longrightarrow i_\delta(\mathcal{N}(\delta_0)).$$

Since $\text{ran}(i_\delta) \cup \{\mu, k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)\} \subseteq X$, we are done. $\blacksquare$ Claim

Thus both $k_\delta^{-1}(F \restriction s_0)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ are elements of X . By the computation done to prove Lemma 1.1(6), we have that

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta}(k_\delta^{-1}(s_0) \cup i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))) \in X.$$

That is, the $(\ell + 1)$ 'st solidity witness for $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is a member of X . Therefore,

$$i_\delta(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta))) \cup \{k_\delta^{-1}(s_0)\}$$

is an initial segment of $r_{\mu^+}(\mathcal{Q}_\delta)$, and the lemma follows. $\blacksquare$ Lemma 1.8

Definition 1.9. If $\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$, then let Φ^ν be the tail of δ in $\{\delta \in \Delta^\nu \mid \delta \text{ is } F\text{-closed}\}$ for which μ is switching for $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$. Put $B_{-\emptyset}(\nu) = \{\lambda_\delta^\nu \mid \delta \in \Phi^\nu\}$.

When the context is clear, we write Φ for Φ^ν . Notice that if $\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$, then Φ is club in μ^+ and $B_{-\emptyset}(\nu)$ is club in ν of order type μ^+ . We are

done defining the basic sequences B_{hull} , B_{triv} , $B_\emptyset$, and $B_{-\emptyset}$. Next, we go back to considering an arbitrary $\nu \in \Gamma$.

Definition 1.10. For each $\nu \in \Gamma$, we define a finite set, $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$, of amenable, 1-sound structures. If $\nu \in \Gamma - \Gamma_{lift}$, then let $\mathcal{M}(\nu) = \{\mathcal{N}(\nu)\}$. Suppose now that $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$. For each $\alpha < \kappa$, define γ_α to be the least ordinal γ such that $\gamma = [a, f]_{\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$ for some $a \in [\alpha]^{<\omega}$ and $f : [\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}]^{|\alpha|} \longrightarrow \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$. Notice that $\alpha \mapsto \gamma_\alpha$ is non-increasing, and therefore takes on only finitely many values. Whenever $\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}} < \alpha < \kappa$, let $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ be the γ_α -scaling of $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$ be the finite set $\{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}\} \cup \{\mathcal{M}_\alpha \mid \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}} < \alpha \in \text{SC} \wedge \mathcal{M}_\alpha \text{ is 1-sound} \wedge p_1(\mathcal{M}_\alpha) = s(E_{\beta(\nu)})\}$.

The idea behind Definition 1.10 is as follows. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and that $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Using $\mathcal{M}$, we shall define another collection of club subsets of ν that are intended to anticipate the possibility that ν is a limit point of the basic club subset for some $\nu' \in \Gamma_{lift} - \nu$. When $\nu \in \Gamma - \Gamma_{lift}$, $\mathcal{M}$ is just $\mathcal{N}(\nu)$. When $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$, we are allowing for the possibility that there is some $\nu' \in \Gamma_{lift} - \nu$ with $\text{crit}(E_{\beta(\nu')}) = \alpha$, and some $\delta \in \Gamma_\emptyset^\alpha$, such that $\lambda_\delta^{\nu'} = \nu$ and $i_\delta^{\nu'}(\alpha) = \gamma_\alpha^\nu$, and $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\nu'} = \mathcal{M}_\alpha^\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Since we are supposed to be proving $\square_{\kappa, <\omega}$, it is important that $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$ be finite. The next lemma is immediate from Lemmas 1.1 and 1.4, and should make the point clearer.

Lemma 1.11. If $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$ and $\delta \in \Delta^\nu$, then $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda_\delta^\nu)$

Definition 1.12 (long). Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Suppose that $\alpha < \kappa$ and q is an initial segment of $p_1(\mathcal{M})$. Put $s_{\alpha,q} = p_1(\mathcal{M}) - q$. Define $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,q}^\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}_1^\mathcal{M}(\alpha \cup q)$ and $j_{\alpha,q}^\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,q}^\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ to be the inverse of the transitive collapse, and $\delta_{\alpha,q}^\mathcal{M} = (\alpha^+)^{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,q}^\mathcal{M}}$. We say that α is **$\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable** if and only if

- (i) α is a limit cardinal
- (ii) $\text{crit}(j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}) = \alpha$ and $j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) > \max(s \cup \{\kappa\})$
- (iii) $j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is cofinal in the ordinals of $\mathcal{M}$
- (iv) $\Gamma_\alpha \cap \delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is cofinal in $\delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$
- (v) $\text{dom}(\vec{E}) \cap (\alpha, \delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}) \neq \emptyset$

Assume that at least condition (ii) holds. Define $F_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$ to be the super-strong extender fragment derived from $j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$, that is,

$$F_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(a, x) \in [j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)]^{<\omega} \times |\mathcal{H}_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}| \mid x \subset [\alpha]^{|a|} \wedge a \in j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}(x)\}.$$

Given any $\delta \in \Gamma_\alpha \cap \delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$, we define

$$(\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} = \text{ult}(\mathcal{N}(\delta), F_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}} \upharpoonright (\kappa \cup s))$$

and

$$(i_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{N}(\delta) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}}$$

to be the ultrapower map and

$$(k_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} : (\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$$

to be the natural map such that

$$j_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}} = (k_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} \circ (i_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}}.$$

Define

$$(\lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} = (\kappa^+)^{(\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}}}.$$

Finally (for Definition 1.12), we say that a pair (α, q) is **$\mathcal{M}$ -considered** if and only if either

$$\alpha \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-}q\text{-reasonable,}$$

or

$$\exists \nu \in \Gamma_{\text{lift}} \ \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)} \text{ and } (\alpha, q) = (\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{M}}, \emptyset).$$

Notation. Note that if $\nu \in \Gamma_{\text{lift}}$, then $\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}} < \alpha$ whenever α and q satisfy condition 1.12(ii), because $\dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$ is in every hull. We shall only

be interested in α that satisfy at least condition 1.12(ii), and so we can make the notational change below without fear of ambiguity with Definition 1.12. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$. Then:

<u>OLD NOTATION:</u>	<u>NEW NOTATION:</u>
F^ν	$F_{\mu, \emptyset}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
j^ν	$j^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
s^ν	$s_{\mu, \emptyset}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
$(\dot{\mu}^+)^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$	$\delta_{\mu, \emptyset}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
$\mathcal{Q}_\delta^\nu$	$(\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\mu, \emptyset})^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
i_δ^ν	$(i_\delta^{\alpha, \emptyset})^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
λ_δ^ν	$(\lambda_\delta^{\alpha, \emptyset})^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
k_δ^ν	$(k_\delta^{\mu, \emptyset})^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
Δ^ν	$\Delta_{\mu, \emptyset}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$
Φ^ν	$\Phi_{\mu, \emptyset}^{\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}}$

As we often dropped the superscript “ ν ” in the old notation, we shall drop the superscript “ $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}$ ” or “ $\mathcal{M}$ ” in the new notation when the context is clear. For us, the two most important instances of α being q - $\mathcal{M}$ -reasonable will be $q = p_1(\mathcal{M})$ and $q = r_\alpha(\mathcal{M})$.

The definitions of the dodd-parameter and dodd-projectum extend in an obvious way to extender fragments (see [MiSchSt]). The following lemma implies that in all cases, $s(F_{\alpha, q}) = s_{\alpha, q}$ and $\tau(F_{\alpha, q}) = \kappa$, and that $F_{\alpha, q}$ is dodd-solid, dodd-amenable, and weakly-amenable.

Lemma 1.13. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, and α is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable. Let $s = s_{\alpha, q} = p_1(\mathcal{M}) - q$, $j = j_{\alpha, q}$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha, q}$, and $F = F_{\alpha, q}$. Say $s = \{s_0 > \cdots > s_\ell\}$. Then the following hold.

- (a) $\text{ult}(\mathcal{H}, F \restriction (\kappa \cup s)) = \text{ult}(\mathcal{H}, F) = \mathcal{M}$
- (b) $0 \leq m \leq \ell \implies F \restriction (s_m \cup (s \restriction m)) \in |\mathcal{M}|$

- (c) $\forall \xi < \kappa \quad F \upharpoonright (\xi \cup s) \in |\mathcal{M}|$
 (d) $\forall \delta < \delta_{\alpha, q} \quad F \cap ([\kappa \cup s]^{< \omega} \times J_\delta^{\mathcal{M}}) \in |\mathcal{M}|$

Proof of 1.13.

Clause (a). Suppose that $x \in |\mathcal{M}|$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is 1-sound, there is a Σ_1 -Skolem term η , and a parameter $a \in [\kappa]^{< \omega}$ such that

$$x = \eta^{\mathcal{M}}[a, s, q].$$

By 1.12(iii), there is a $\sigma < \text{OR}^{\mathcal{H}}$ such that

$$x = \eta^{\mathcal{M} \upharpoonright j(\sigma)}[a, s, q].$$

Define $f : [\alpha]^{a \cup s} \longrightarrow |\mathcal{H}|$ by

$$f(u) = \eta^{\mathcal{H} \upharpoonright \sigma}[u^{a, a \cup s}, u^{s, a \cup s}, j^{-1}(q)].$$

Then $f \in |\mathcal{H}|$ and $x = [a \cup s, f]_F^{\mathcal{H}} = j(f)(a \cup s)$.

Clauses (b) and (c). Suppose that $0 \leq m \leq \ell$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is 1-solid,

$$Th_1^{\mathcal{M}}(s_m \cup q \cup (s \upharpoonright m)) \in |\mathcal{M}|.$$

From this theory, we can easily compute $F \upharpoonright (s_m \cup (s \upharpoonright m))$ inside $\mathcal{M}$.

Clause (c) follows from the fact that $\pi_1(\mathcal{M}) = \kappa$.

Clause (d). Given $\delta < \delta_{\alpha, q}$, pick $e \in |\mathcal{H}|$ such that $e : \alpha \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\alpha, q}$. Then for $a \in [\kappa]^{< \omega}$ and $\xi < \alpha$,

$$(a \cup s, e(\xi)) \in F \iff a \cup s \in j(e)(\xi)$$

Thus $F \cap ([\kappa \cup s]^{< \omega} \times J_\delta^{\mathcal{M}}) \in |\mathcal{M}|$ ■ Lemma 1.13

The following lemma is proved essentially as were Lemmas 1.1 and 1.4, using Lemma 1.13 in the obvious way.

Lemma 1.14. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, and (α, q) is $\mathcal{M}$ -considered. Then, for sufficiently large $\delta \in (\alpha, \delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}})$, all clauses of

Lemmas 1.1 and 1.4 hold for (α, q) , in the obvious sense. In particular, $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q} \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q})$.

We next define a new family of club subsets of ν , one for each triple $(\mathcal{M}, \alpha, q)$ such that $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, q an initial segment of $p_1(\mathcal{M})$, and α is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable. It seems likely that for a fixed $\mathcal{M}$, there could be infinitely many corresponding α ; this entails a difficulty to be dealt with later.

Definition 1.15. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ and (α, q) is $\mathcal{M}$ -considered. Define $\Delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$ to be the tail of $\Gamma_\alpha \cap \delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}$ on which the conclusion of Lemma 1.14 holds. Define

$$D(\mathcal{M}, \alpha, q) = \{(\lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q})^{\mathcal{M}} \mid \delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}}\}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{M}$ determines ν . Also notice that Definition 1.15 is consistent with the definition of $\Delta_{\mu, \emptyset}^{\mathcal{M}}$ given in the case $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}$. If $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$ with $\mu = \text{crit}(E_{\beta(\nu)})$, then, by definition,

$$\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset \implies B_\emptyset(\nu) = D(\nu, \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, \mu, \emptyset)$$

$$\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset} \implies B_{-\emptyset}(\nu) \subseteq D(\nu, \mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, \mu, \emptyset).$$

The following lemma follows easily from what we have already established. Together with the existence of our sequences B_{hull} and B_{triv} , Lemma 1.16 already implies that $\square_{\kappa, \kappa}(\Gamma)$ holds.

Lemma 1.16. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Assume that (α, q) is $\mathcal{M}$ -considered. Then the following hold.

- (a) $\delta \mapsto \lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q}$ is a continuous, increasing, cofinal function from $\Delta_{\alpha, q}$ into ν . In particular, $D(\mathcal{M}, \alpha, q)$ is a club subset of ν with

$$\text{o.t.}(D(\mathcal{M}, \alpha, q)) \leq \delta_{\alpha, q} \leq \alpha^+ \leq \kappa.$$

- (b) Suppose that $\delta \in \lim(\Delta_{\alpha, q})$. Let $p = i_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$. Then α is $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$ - p -reasonable and

$$D(\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}, \alpha, p) = \lambda_{\delta}^{\alpha, q} \cap D(\mathcal{M}, \alpha, q).$$

In Lemmas and Definitions 1.17–1.21, we are mainly concerned with the case in which $s_{\alpha, q} = \emptyset$.

Lemma 1.17. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Assume that α is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable, where q is an initial segment of $p_1(M)$, and $s = s_{\alpha, q} = p_1(\mathcal{M}) - q$. Then the following hold.

- (a) Suppose that $\beta > \alpha$ and β is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable. Suppose further that $j_{\beta, q}(\beta) = j_{\alpha, q}(\alpha)$. Then

$$D(\mathcal{M}, \alpha, q) \subseteq D(\mathcal{M}, \beta, q).$$

- (b) The collection of β such that β is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable and $j_{\beta, q}(\beta) = j_{\alpha, q}(\alpha)$
- (c) If $q = p_1(\mathcal{M})$, then there is a largest β such that β is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable.
- (d) Suppose that $q = p_1(\mathcal{M})$. Suppose that $\delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}$ and $\beta \in (\alpha, \kappa)$ are such that $\kappa = j_{\alpha, q}(f)(a)$ for some $a \in [\beta]^{< \omega}$ and some $f : [\alpha]^{|a|} \rightarrow \alpha$. Let $p = i_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$. Then α is $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$ - p -reasonable, but β is not $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$ - p -reasonable.

Proof of Lemma 1.17.

Clause (a). Fix an $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable $\beta > \alpha$ with $j_{\beta, q}(\beta) = j_{\alpha, q}(\alpha)$. Suppose that $\delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}$. We must find $\varepsilon \in \Delta_{\beta, q}$ such that $\lambda_{\delta}^{\alpha, q} = \lambda_{\varepsilon}^{\beta, q}$. Let

$$\tilde{j} = j_{\beta, q}^{-1} \circ j_{\alpha, q} : \mathcal{H}_{\alpha, q} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\beta, q}.$$

Note that $\text{crit}(\tilde{j}) = \alpha$ and $\tilde{j}(\alpha) = \beta$. Let G be the (α, β) -extender derived from $\tilde{j}$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \text{ult}(\mathcal{N}(\delta), G)$ and $\tilde{i} : \mathcal{N}(\delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ be the ultrapower map. Put $\varepsilon = (\alpha^+)^{\mathcal{P}}$. We show that this ε works.

Let $\tilde{k} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \tilde{j}(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$ be the natural almost Σ_1 -elementary embedding such that $\tilde{j} \upharpoonright |\mathcal{N}(\delta)| = \tilde{k} \circ \tilde{i}$. It is easy to see that $\varepsilon = \text{crit}(\tilde{k}) < \delta_{\beta,q}$ and $\tilde{k}(\varepsilon) = \delta_{\beta,q}$. So ε is a local β^+ less than $\delta_{\beta,q}$, that is, $\varepsilon \in \Gamma_\beta \cap \delta_{\beta,q}$.

The verification that $\varepsilon \in \Delta_{\beta,q}$ amounts to checking that various bounded subsets of $j_{\alpha,q}(\alpha) = j_{\beta,q}(\beta)$ that are in the range of $k_\delta^{\alpha,q}$ are also in the range of $k_\varepsilon^{\beta,q}$, which follows from the $(\implies)$ direction of the following easy claim.

Claim. Suppose that $\xi < j_{\alpha,q}(\alpha) = j_{\beta,q}(\beta)$. Then

$$\exists a \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \exists f \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}} \quad j_{\alpha,q}(f)(a \cup s) = \xi \iff \exists b \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \exists g \in J_\varepsilon^{\vec{E}} \quad j_{\beta,q}(g)(b \cup s) = \xi$$

$(\implies)$ Let $b = a - \beta$ and $c = a \cap \beta$, and $g(u) = \tilde{j}(f)(c \cup u)$. Then $j_{\beta,q}(g)(b \cup s) = \xi$. Since $g \in \text{ran}(\tilde{k})$ and is a subset of β , we have that $g \in J_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{P}} = J_\varepsilon^{\vec{E}}$.

$(\impliedby)$ Again, $g \in J_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{P}}$, so we may write $g = \tilde{j}(h)(c)$ for some $h \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$ and $c \in [\beta]^{<\omega}$. Let $a = c \cup b$ and $f(u) = h(u^{c, a \cup s})(u^{b \cup s, a \cup s})$. Then $j_{\alpha,q}(f)(a \cup s) = \xi$.

But now, using both directions of the claim, we see that $\lambda_\delta^{\alpha,q} = \lambda_\varepsilon^{\beta,q}$.

Clause (b). Suppose that β is a limit of $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable ordinals. It is clear that clauses (i)–(iii) of Definition 1.12 hold at β . This is enough to make sense of the definitions of $j_{\beta,q}$, $\delta_{\beta,q}$, and $\lambda_\delta^{\beta,q}$ for $\delta < \delta_{\beta,q}$. It remains to see that 1.12(iv) and 1.12(v) hold. We show 1.12(iv), $\Gamma_\beta \cap \delta_{\beta,q}$ is cofinal in $\delta_{\beta,q}$, and leave 1.12(v) to the reader.

Since the function $\gamma \mapsto j_{\gamma, q}(\gamma)$ is non-increasing on the $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable ordinals below β , $\{j_{\gamma, q}(\gamma) \mid \gamma < \beta \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-}q\text{-reasonable}\}$ is finite. So, without loss of generality, $\beta > \alpha$ and $j_{\alpha, q}(\alpha) = j_{\beta, q}(\beta)$.

Let G be as in the proof of Clause (a), and for each $\delta < \delta_{\alpha, q}$, let $\mathcal{P}_\delta = \text{ult}(\mathcal{N}(\delta), G)$ and $\varepsilon_\delta = (\beta^+)^{\mathcal{P}_\delta}$. Let $S = \{\varepsilon_\delta \mid \delta < \delta_{\alpha, q}\}$. The proof of Clause (a) shows that $S \subseteq \Gamma_\beta \cap \delta_{\beta, q}$ and that $\lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q} = \lambda_{\varepsilon_\delta}^{\beta, q}$ whenever $\delta < \delta_{\alpha, q}$. Let $\varepsilon = \sup(S)$. If $\varepsilon < \delta_{\beta, q}$, then using the proof of Lemma 1.13(d), we get that $\lambda_\varepsilon^{\beta, q} < \nu$. But $\lambda_\varepsilon^{\beta, q} > \lambda_{\varepsilon_\delta}^{\beta, q} = \lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q}$ for every $\alpha \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}$, and so $\lambda_\varepsilon^{\beta, q} \geq \nu$, which is absurd. So 1.12(iv) holds for β .

Clause (c). Assume that $q = p_1(\mathcal{M})$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is 1-sound, for large enough $\alpha < \kappa$,

$$\kappa \in H_1^{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha \cup p_1(M)).$$

For such α , condition 1.12(ii) rules out α being $\mathcal{M}$ - $p_1(M)$ -reasonable.

Clause (d). That α is $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}$ - p -reasonable follows from earlier lemmas. Suppose, to the contrary, that β is $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}$ - p -reasonable. It is easy to see that $i_\delta^{\alpha, q}(f)(a) = \kappa$. Also, $i_\delta^{\alpha, q} = (j_{\alpha, p})^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}}$. But then, using the Claim in the proof of 1.17(a), we see that $\kappa \in \text{ran}(j_{\beta, p})^{\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}}$. This is a contradiction, since β violates 1.12(ii) in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}$ - p -reasonable. ■ Lemma 1.17

Definition 1.18. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Define

$$e(\mathcal{M}) = \{j_{\alpha, q}(\alpha) \mid (\alpha, q) \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-considered and } s_{\alpha, q}^{\mathcal{M}} = \emptyset\}.$$

Note that $e(\mathcal{M})$ is a finite set that may be empty. For each $\zeta \in e(\nu)$, define $\mathbf{a}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ to be the largest α such that (α, q) is $\mathcal{M}$ -considered and $j_{\alpha, q}(\alpha) = \zeta$. Suppose that $\alpha = \mathbf{a}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Define $\mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ to be the least $\beta \geq \alpha$ such that $\kappa = j_{\alpha, q}(f)(a)$ for some $a \in [\beta]^{< \omega}$ and some $f : [\alpha]^{|\alpha|} \longrightarrow \alpha$. If f is least such that $\kappa = j_{\alpha, q}(f)(a)$ for some

$a \in [\mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)]^{<\omega}$, then define $\Delta(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ to be the tail of $\delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}$ for which $f \in J_\delta^E$. Let

$$S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) = \{\lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q} \mid \delta \in \Delta(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)\}.$$

For any $\delta \in \Delta(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$, let $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q}) = \mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}$ and $Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \lambda_\delta^{\alpha, q}) = i_\delta^{\alpha, q}(\alpha)$.

Note that 1.17(c) justifies the definition of $\mathbf{a}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. We remark that if $\nu \in \Gamma_\emptyset$ and $\mu = \text{crit}(E_{\beta(\nu)})$, then $S(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, j(\mu))$ is a tail of $B_\emptyset(\nu)$. The following lemma puts together some facts that we have already established. It is used, among other things, to justify the subsequent inductive definition.

Lemma 1.19. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, and $\zeta \in e(\mathcal{M})$. Assume that $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Then the following hold.

- (a) $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ is club in ν
- (b) $\text{o.t.}(S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)) \leq \mathbf{a}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)^+ \leq \kappa$
- (c) $\mathbf{a}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \leq \mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) < \kappa$
- (c) $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}) \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\nu})$.
- (d) $Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}) \in e(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}))$
- (e) $\mathbf{a}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \leq \mathbf{a}(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}), Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}))$
 $\leq \mathbf{b}(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}), Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu})) = \mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$
- (f) $\bar{\nu} \cap S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \subseteq S(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}), Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}))$

Definition 1.20. We define a function $C_\emptyset$ with domain

$$\{(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \text{ and } \zeta \in e(\mathcal{M}) \text{ for some } \nu \in \Gamma\}$$

by induction on ν . Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$. Assume that we have defined $C_\emptyset$ restricted to the set

$$\{(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\nu}) \text{ and } \zeta \in e(\mathcal{M}) \text{ for some } \bar{\nu} < \nu\}$$

Then for $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ and $\zeta \in e(\mathcal{M})$, we define $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ to be

$$S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \cup \bigcup \{C_\emptyset(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu}), Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu})) \mid \bar{\nu} \in \lim(S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta))\}.$$

Lemma 1.21. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, and $\zeta \in e(\mathcal{M})$. Then the following hold.

- (a) $\text{card}(C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)) \leq \mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)^+$
- (b) Suppose that $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu})$ and $\bar{\zeta} = Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \bar{\nu})$. Then $C_\emptyset(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\zeta}) = \bar{\nu} \cap C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$.
- (c) Suppose that $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Then there are $\bar{\mathcal{Q}} \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\nu})$ and $\bar{\zeta} \in e(\bar{\nu})$ such that $C_\emptyset(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\zeta}) = \bar{\nu} \cap C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$.

Proof of 1.21.

Clause (a). By induction on ν . By the definition of $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$, Lemma 1.19, and the induction hypothesis, $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ is the union of at most $\mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)^+$ many sets, each of size at most $\mathbf{b}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)^+$. Recalling that κ is a limit cardinal, (a) follows.

Clause (b). By induction on ν . Assume that clause (b) holds for all $\nu' < \nu$. Suppose that $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$.

If $\bar{\nu}$ is the greatest limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$, then by the induction hypothesis and the definition of $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$,

$$C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) = C_\emptyset(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\zeta}) \cup (S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) - \bar{\nu}),$$

and it is clear that clause (b) holds.

Consider an arbitrary $\nu' > \bar{\nu}$ such that ν' is also a limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Let $\mathcal{Q}' = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \nu')$ and $\zeta' = Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \nu')$. By Lemma 1.19, $\nu' \cap S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \subseteq S(\mathcal{Q}', \zeta')$. Thus $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $S(\mathcal{Q}', \zeta')$. By the induction hypothesis, clause (b) holds at ν' , and hence

$$(\star) \quad C_\emptyset(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\zeta}) = \bar{\nu} \cap C_\emptyset(\mathcal{Q}', \zeta').$$

If ν is a limit of limit points of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$, then clause (b) holds by $(\star)$ and the definition of $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$.

If ν is not a limit of limit points of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$, then take ν' to be the greatest limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Applying $(\star)$ to the definition of $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ again, we see that clause (b) holds.

Clause (c). By induction on ν . If $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$, then we are done by clause (b). So we may assume that there is a $\nu' > \nu$ such that ν' is a limit point of $S(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$. Let $\mathcal{Q}' = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \nu')$ and $\zeta' = Z(\mathcal{M}, \zeta, \nu')$. Then $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{Q}', \zeta') = \nu' \cap C(\mathcal{M}, \zeta)$ by clause (b). So $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{Q}', \zeta')$. By the induction hypothesis, there is an $\bar{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\nu})$ and $\bar{\zeta} \in e(\bar{\mathcal{M}})$ such that

$$C_\emptyset(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\zeta}) = \bar{\nu} \cap C_\emptyset(\mathcal{Q}', \zeta') = \bar{\nu} \cap C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta),$$

so we are done. $\blacksquare$ Lemma 1.21

In the next few lemmas and definitions we are mainly concerned with the case $s_{\alpha, q} \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 1.22. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Suppose that (α, q) is $\mathcal{M}$ -considered and that $\delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}$. We say that δ is $F_{\alpha, q}$ -**closed** if and only if for every $x \subseteq \alpha$, if there are $a \in [\delta]^{<\omega}$ and $f \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$ such that $x = j_{\alpha, q}(f)(a \cup s_{\alpha, q})$, then $x \in J_\delta^{\vec{E}}$.

Note that Definition 1.22 is consistent with Definition 1.5. The following lemma is proved as was Lemma 1.6.

Lemma 1.23. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Suppose that (α, q) is $\mathcal{M}$ -considered and that $\delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q}$ is $F_{\alpha, q}$ -closed. Then $r_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_\delta^{\alpha, q}) = i_\delta^{\alpha, q}(p_1(\mathcal{N}(\delta)))$.

If $\nu \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$ with $\mu = \text{crit}(E_{\beta(\nu)})$, then we defined $\Phi_{\mu, \emptyset}$ to be the tail of the $F_{\mu, \emptyset}$ -closed δ in $\Delta_{\mu, \emptyset}$ such that μ is switching for $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\mu, \emptyset}$. (This is Definition 1.9 in the “new notation”.) And we defined $B_{-\emptyset}(\nu) = \{\lambda_{\delta}^{\mu, \emptyset} \mid \delta \in \Phi_{\mu, \emptyset}\}$. For consistency with the definition in the next paragraph, let us, in this case, put $\Phi(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, \mu) = \Phi_{\mu, \emptyset}$ and $C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, \mu) = B_{-\emptyset}(\nu)$.

Now suppose that $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and that $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Suppose that $\alpha \in \text{SC}$. Put $q = r_{\alpha}(\mathcal{M})$. Suppose that α is $\mathcal{M}$ - q -reasonable, and that α is switching for $\mathcal{M}$. In particular, $s_{\alpha, q} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $A = \{\delta \in \Delta_{\alpha, q} \mid \delta \text{ is } F_{\alpha, q}\text{-closed}\}$ is club in $\delta_{\alpha, q}$. Suppose that for sufficiently large δ in A , we have that α is switching for $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$. In that case, we let $\Phi(\mathcal{M}, \alpha)$ be the tail of δ in A for which α is switching for $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$, and we put

$$C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha) = \{\lambda_{\delta}^{\alpha, q} \mid \delta \in \Phi(\mathcal{M}, \alpha)\}.$$

Let us say that α is **$\mathcal{M}$ -critical** if and only if $C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha)$ is defined (that is, if it is defined by one of the two cases above). There are only finitely many $\mathcal{M}$ -critical α for a given $\mathcal{M}$, since to each critical α , we can associate a distinct partition of $p_1(\mathcal{M})$. The following is an easy consequence of Lemmas 1.16(b), 1.23, and the definitions just given.

Lemma 1.24. Suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$. Suppose that α is $\mathcal{M}$ -critical and that $\bar{\nu}$ is a limit point of $C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha)$. Say $\bar{\nu} = \lambda_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$, where $q = \emptyset$ if $\alpha = \dot{\mu}^{\mathcal{M}}$, and $q = r_{\alpha}(\mathcal{M})$ otherwise. Then α is $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}$ -critical and

$$C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{Q}_{\delta}^{\alpha, q}, \alpha) = \bar{\nu} \cap C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha).$$

We are finally ready to write down our $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}(\Gamma)$ sequence, $\mathcal{F}$. If $\nu \in \Gamma_{\text{hull}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\nu) = & \{B_{\text{hull}}(\nu)\} \cup \{C_{\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \wedge \zeta \in e(\mathcal{M})\} \\ & \cup \{C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \wedge \alpha \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-critical}\} \end{aligned}$$

If $\nu \in \Gamma_{triv}$, then

$$\mathcal{F}(\nu) = \{B_{triv}(\nu)\} \cup \{C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \wedge \zeta \in e(\mathcal{M})\} \\ \cup \{C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \wedge \alpha \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-critical}\}$$

If $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$, then

$$\mathcal{F}(\nu) = \{C_\emptyset(\mathcal{M}, \zeta) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \wedge \zeta \in e(\mathcal{M})\} \\ \cup \{C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{M}, \alpha) \mid \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu) \wedge \alpha \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-critical}\}$$

That $\mathcal{F}$ witnesses $\square_{\kappa, < \omega}(\Gamma)$ now follows easily from our various lemmas and observations; we emphasize just a few points. First, we claim that each $\mathcal{F}(\nu)$ is non-empty. This is visibly so if $\nu \in \Gamma_{hull} \cup \Gamma_{triv}$, so suppose that $\nu \in \Gamma_{lift}$. Let $\mu = \text{crit}(E_{\beta(\nu)})$ and $j : L[\vec{E}] \longrightarrow \text{ult}(L[\vec{E}], E_{\beta(\nu)})$. If $\gamma \in \Gamma_{-\emptyset}$, then μ is $\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}$ -critical, so $C_{-\emptyset}(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, \mu)$ is defined. If $\gamma \in \Gamma_\emptyset$, then $j_{\mu, \emptyset}(\mu) \in e(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)})$ and $C_\emptyset(\mathcal{J}_{\beta(\nu)}, j(\mu))$ is defined. Second, we claim that $\mathcal{F}(\nu)$ is finite. This is because $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$ is finite, and $e(\mathcal{M})$ is finite whenever $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, and there are only finitely many $\mathcal{M}$ -critical ordinals. Third, each element of $\mathcal{F}(\nu)$ is a club subset of ν of order type at most κ . This is essentially a consequence of Lemma 1.16 and Lemma 1.21(a). Finally, the coherence property, Definition 0(d), holds for sets $C \in \mathcal{F}(\nu)$. If $C \in \text{ran}(B_{hull})$, then this follows from §2 of [Sch]. If $C \in \text{ran}(B_{triv})$, then there is nothing to check, since $\text{o.t.}(C) = \omega$. If $C \in \text{ran}(C_\emptyset)$, then we quote Lemma 1.21(c). And if $C \in \text{ran}(C_{-\emptyset})$, then use Lemma 1.24. $\blacksquare$ Theorem 1

REFERENCES

- [BM] S. Ben-David and M. Magidor, *The Weak $\square^*$ is Really Weaker Than the Full $\square$* , J. Symbolic Logic. **51** 4 (1986) 1029-1033.
- [J1] R.B. Jensen, *The Fine Structure of the Constructible Hierarchy*, Annals of Math. Logic **4** (1972) 229-308.
- [J2] R.B. Jensen, *Some remarks on $\square$ below $0^\sharp$* , handwritten.
- [MiSchSt] W.J. Mitchell, E. Schimmerling, and J.R. Steel, *The Covering Lemma up to One Woodin Cardinal*, submitted for publication.

- [MiSt] W.J. Mitchell and J.R. Steel, *Fine Structure and Iteration Trees*, Lecture Notes in Logic 3, Springer-Verlag (1994).
- [Sch] E. Schimmerling, *Combinatorial Principles in the Core Model for one Woodin Cardinal*, to appear in Annals of Pure and Applied Logic.
- [MiSch] W.J. Mitchell and E. Schimmerling, *Weak Covering Without Countable Closure*.
- [SchSt] E. Schimmerling and J.R. Steel, *Fine Structure for Tame Inner Models*, submitted for publication.
- [S] R.M. Solovay, *The fine structure of $L[\mu]$* , unpublished.
- [SRK] R.M. Solovay, W.N. Reinhardt, and A. Kanamori, *Strong axioms of infinity and elementary embeddings*, Ann. Math. Logic, **13** (1978), 73-116.
- [St1] J.R. Steel, *The Core Model Iterability Problem*, to appear in Lecture Notes in Logic.
- [St2] J.R. Steel, *Inner Models With Many Woodin Cardinals*, Ann. of Pure and Appl. Logic 65 (1993), 185–209.
- [St3] J.R. Steel, *Core Models With More Woodin Cardinals*, in preparation.
- [T] S. Todorcevic, *A Note on the Proper Forcing Axiom*, Contemporary Mathematics **95** (1984) 209-218.
- [We] P.D. Welch, *Combinatorial Principles in the Core Model*, Oxford doctoral dissertation.
- [Wy] D.J. Wylie, MIT doctoral dissertation (1990).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

E-mail address: `ernest@math.mit.edu`